

Meeting Summary

King County Metro Long Range Public Transportation Plan

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting August 31, 2015, 2:30 PM – 4:30 PM

8th Floor Conference Room, 201 S Jackson St, Seattle, WA 98104

Attendees

Name	Agency
Stephen Padua	Kirkland
Gil Cerise	PSRC
Craig Hellmann	PSRC
Darin Stavish	Pierce Transit
Jim Seitz	Renton
Jacob Tracy	Lake Forest Park
Rick Perez	Federal Way
Jaimie Reavis	Tukwila
Scott McCall	Shoreline
Ben Smith	Seattle DOT
Ying Ying Kwan	Seattle DOT
Katie Kuciemba	Sound Cities Association
Hayley Bonsteel	Kent
Monica Whitman	Kent
Andrew Zagars	Sammamish
Andrea Snyder	Issaquah
Karen Kitsis	Sound Transit
Kathy Leotta	Sound Transit
Kris Overleese	Kenmore
Paula Stevens	Bellevue
Bob Lindskov	Covington
Chester Knapp	Redmond
Roland Behee	Community Transit

King County Staff

Stephen Hunt, Tristan Cook, Lisa Shafer, Graydon Newman, Briana Lovell, Andrew Brick

Consultant Staff

Alicia McIntire/Parametrix, Sophie Mecham/Transpo Group, Aaron Gooze/Fehr & Peers, Chris Breiland/Fehr & Peers

2:30 – 2:50 – Summary of Survey and Outreach (Tristan)

- Held joint open houses with Sound Transit in June; approximately 257 attendees at the four open houses
 - o Shared information about the different service emphases and asked attendees to create their own ideal transit mix

- Evening Seattle open house had a heavy emphasis on frequent
- Emphasis on express network across the board
- Survey: ran from June – August
 - 6000+ responses
 - 50% respondents were from outside of Seattle
 - Income was fairly representative of King County as a whole
 - High representation of women, Caucasian people
 - Strong interest in all three types of service
 - Integration with other transit modes: #1 choice was reducing travel time, making transfers easy was also popular choice
 - Capital improvements: popular answers were improvements to arterials that make transit reliable and improvements to park-and-rides
- Roundtable Meeting – Sept. 10th
 - Reps from organizations that support non-English speaking populations
 - Will discuss parallel topics to the survey
 - Will ask groups how we can support their outreach efforts to their populations and follow up with another meeting early next year

Question: Are you going to do outreach to low income groups? I suggest the Renton Housing Authority and other housing authorities.

Answer: We will add that one; let us know if you think of other groups.

Comment: You should add the Boys & Girls Clubs.

Comment: You should reach out to the King County Mobility Coalition (Hopelink).

2:50 – 3:10 – Review of additional analysis requested by TAC (Aaron)

Comment (Stephen): We have included the manufacturing and industrial centers at the request of the TAC.

Comment (Aaron): General trends – the frequent network is based on full integration, a large reduction of actual bus trips going into downtown Seattle. Local has some express service, but the integration is more than the express network itself. One thing to note is the frequent service type lends itself better to integrating with light rail due to its high frequency.

Comment (Aaron): We will be doing a full model coding of the bus network, which will let us see ridership on specific routes (opposed to a system-wide total). This will help us see capacity constraints.

Question: Are there any assumptions for HCT on 405?

Answer (Aaron): There wasn't anything as far as 405 BRT. That will be part of the next modeling effort.

3:10 – 3:30 – Summary of capital impacts in service emphases (Chris)

- We used a high level sketch planning tool so that we could test many different strategies
- We “cooked in” assumptions about improvements to speed and reliability corridors, direct access ramps, and park and ride lots

- Review change in daily boardings and change in annual revenue hours resulting from whether or not we make certain improvements
 - o These investments have a notable impact on the performance of the system

Question: What about bus barn capacity?

Answer: Maintenance facilities are part of the Long Range Plan. It's inherent to the study and it's a given that if we add a certain amount of hours a new maintenance facility is needed.

Question: Are you assuming two boardings per park and ride stall?

Answer (Chris): Yes that is correct. It is a conservative assumption.

3:30 – 3:50 – Summary of regional TAC input (Graydon)

- Thank you, we had strong attendance at the regional TAC meetings (three meetings: Kent, Kenmore, and Mercer Island)
 - o There was a general trend towards frequent service (tended to match best with comp plans)
 - o Attendees also showed interest in express service – primarily from less dense or further away municipalities. Saw value in center-to-center connections
 - o Interest in the connection to HCT (primarily ST3 projects) – Interest in connecting with these future alignments
 - o Interest in park and rides, especially service to park-and-rides, as well as potential management and capacity issues
 - o Better connections to eastside municipalities

Comment: The estimate for cost per mile of improvements seems very low. I think there is demand from riders for speed improvements.

Comment: I think raising awareness of what's needed is a good first step.

Comment (Federal Way): We can talk about TSP improvements, but we need to deliver. In my experience I agree that these improvements are more expensive per mile than you have identified.

Comment (Shoreline): Part of this depends on the type of service that will be delivered, as to how engaged various municipalities will be/how willing they are willing to invest. We should try to marry what we're planning in the long term with the goals of the comp plans. Communities will be willing to partner if they see these improvements as being valuable to them in the long term and aligning with their goals/concerns.

Question (Kenmore): are you going to do license plate surveys at park and rides to see where people are coming from?

Answer: We will have information on that at a later date

Comment: Our 6-year TIP includes projects that affect bus routes (ex. widening main arterial through the city). These are projects we want to have done in the next year, and want to have these improvements incorporated with the Long Range Plan. We want a better understanding of how these near-term actions can be reflected in the Long Range Plan.

Comment (Sound Cities): It's kind of a sequence, so that we know the local municipalities are making improvements that integrate successfully with the Long Range Plan's improvements. (How can we best coordinate short and long term goals?)

Question (Sound Transit): Sound Transit recently adopted a list of things to study; it is also useful to us to see what your planned improvements are.

3:50 – 4:00 – Discuss outline of Long Range Plan (Briana)

- We envision we will have a large amount of plan content, and each section will have “leveled down” policy language
- We envision a strategic element – how Metro is looking into the future, customer experience programs, etc.
- Service element – network concept, what we ended up with as far as mix of service types
- Capital element – discussion of access to transit piece, speed and reliability improvements, changes in fleet needs
- Financial element – cost of the plan, what our strategy is for funding it, breaking the plan into smaller phased pieces

4:00 – 4:15 – Introduce top strategy topics

- We anticipate some continuation of the partnership program
 - o How do we think about capital investments in the future – what is Metro's role in helping the region realize this future?
 - o Confirming that our service concepts are the right set of service concepts
 - o What the role of transit is with Uber, Car 2 Go, and other innovations

Question (Stephen): What info/data do you think would be most useful?

Comment: We don't have transit planners in Issaquah, so we seek your expertise. We look to Metro to provide expertise, and I think having Metro's Long Range Plan will be very helpful for us.

Comment: As things are planned for the future, where is it addressed in the Long Range Plan about how Metro is planning around investments made by others? How do we ensure the Long Range Plan stays relevant over time?

Question (Sound Cities): Also consider the transportation package that passed in Olympia – How is Metro planning to capitalize on these huge transportation investments?

Answer (Lisa): we are making assumptions based on large projects we know of (ex. Sound Transit's list of projects). All of these things factor into what we're building a network around and how we are doing our analysis. We are also doing focused work on identified “corridors of shared interest”.

4:15 – 4:30 – Review updated TAC work program (Andrew)

- Draft updated work program for the TAC
 - o This is allowing us to be coordinated with Sound Transit, have time to react to what they propose in their draft plan
- Engaging in the service network plan
 - o Worked with Remix (TransitMix) and Fehr & Peers on developing this

- You will be able to explore the entirety of the network (we will provide logins to this web-based tool)
- We are looking for your feedback from late October – late November

Question: Can this be shared publicly?

Answer: This is a trial, but I think there is interest in having municipalities be able to share with their communities.

Question: Will we be able to see the sources for the data layers?

Answer (Aaron): They have a pretty good documentation for where it is from. They are open if you need additional information.

Next TAC Meeting – October 20, Location TBD

DRAFT